



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,467	01/22/2002	Dana Scranton	258/116	6380
34055	7590	03/22/2004	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP POST OFFICE BOX 1208 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208			STINSON, FRANKIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,467

Applicant(s)

SCRANTON ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/4/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Art Unit: 1746

1. the following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by either Elsayy et al., Verhaverbeke et al., Onoda et al., or Ogasawara et al., hereinafter, the applied prior art.

For example in claim 1, note that Elsayy, Verhaverbeke, Onoda and Ogasawara each disclose a processor (12 in Elsayy, 10 in Verhaverbeke, 7, 11 in Onoda and 11 in Ogasawara) for cleaning, rinsing, and drying workpieces (W in Elsayy, 11 in Verhaverbeke, 3 in Onoda and W in Ogasawara) comprising: a process vessel adapted to hold one or more workpieces therein; a vapor processing system (16 in Elsayy, 15 in Verhaverbeke, 61 Ogasawara and 105 in Onoda) for supplying a vapor into the process vessel, for processing the workpieces; a liquid supply system (34 in Elsayy, 37 in Verhaverbeke, 97 in Onoda and 22, 24 in Ogasawara) for introducing a liquid into the process vessel to rinse the workpieces by immersing the workpieces in the liquid; and a drying system (66 in Elsayy, see col. 14, lines 33-56 in Verhaverbeke, 98 in Onoda and 53 in Ogasawara) supplying a drying fluid into the process vessel, for drying the workpieces.

Art Unit: 1746

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 4-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art in view of either Yoneda, Oya et al., and Kashkoush et al. Claim 2 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the ozone supply system. Yoneda, Oya and Kashkoush each disclose in a processor for cleaning/drying workpieces, an ozone supply system. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the processor of either piece of the applied prior art, to employ an ozone supply system as taught by either Yoneda, Oya or Kashkoush, for the purpose of enhancing the cleaning process in the removal of oxidizable contaminants (resist) from the surface of the workpieces as is common in the art. Re claim 4, Yoneda and Kashkoush disclose the ozone supply system. Re claim 5, Oya discloses the ozone bubbler (3). Re claim 6, Yoneda discloses the gas diffuser (7) at the top of the vessel. Re claim 7, Yoneda discloses the heater (3). Re claim 10, Yoneda, Oya and Kashkoush disclose the injectors as claimed.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art in view of Scovell.

Claim 9 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the motor for spinning the workpieces. Scovell discloses the workpieces being rotated/spun by a motor. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the

processor of either piece of the applied prior art, to provide the workpieces with a spinning action as taught by Scovell, for the purpose of ensuring complete exposure of the surface of the workpiece to the processing fluid.

6. Claims 11, 15 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Kashkoush et al

For example, Kashkoush each disclose a processor for cleaning, rinsing and drying workpieces comprising a process vessel (30) to hold one or more workpieces therein: an ozone injection means (47) for introducing ozone gas into the process vessel by bubbling ozone gas up through the process vessel, a liquid injection system (38) and a gas drying system (see col. 18 lines 37-42).

7. Claims 12, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashkoush et al. in view of Yoneda.

Claim 12 defines over Kashkoush only in the recitation of the gas diffuser being located at the top of the vessel. Yoneda discloses the gas diffuser (7) located at the top on the vessel. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the process vessel of Kashkoush, to have the gas diffuser at the top of the process vessel as taught by Yoneda, for the purpose of ensuring the adequate application of drying gas to the workpiece so that gravity will assist in the removal of residual process liquids. Re claim 13, Yoneda discloses the heater (3). Re claim 16, Yoneda disclose gas spray nozzles (7).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashkoush et al. in view of Scovell.

Art Unit: 1746

Claim 14 defined over Kashkoush only in the recitation of the spinning of the workpiece. Scovell discloses the spinning of the workpiece as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Kashkoush, to have the workpieces provided with a spinning action as taught by Scovell, for the purpose of ensuring complete exposure of the surface of the workpieces to the processing fluids.


9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Ni, Degendt et al., Gogg et al., Bergman et al., Iwahashi et al., Kamikawa et al., Dryer et al., Shindo et al. and Japan'766, note the workpiece process vessels.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached M-F from 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and some Saturdays from 5:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700 (571) 272-1700.

Any inquiry for missing parts of this Office Action (copies of references, pages, forms etc.), contact the TEAM LEADER Ms. Nicol Scott (571) 272-1045.


FRANKIE L. STINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3400-1700